

The Role of the US and Power Challenges in the New Geopolitical Order

Assist. Prof. Dr. Murat ALAKEL*

Dr. Murat BAKIR**

Abstract

There are various factors may affect the leadership position of hegemonic powers in the ever-lasting great power struggles. The quantitative classical realist power elements, military power, population, and geographical location are some more important considerations; today, those are also highly valuable quantitatively and qualitatively: energy resources, high-tech and nano industries, social capital, services, financial institutions and environmental concerned good and technologies. The leading role and tasks of the US has changed and expanded aftermath the Cold War period. On one hand, the US has undoubtedly become the world's biggest power; on the other hand, new powers to challenge the US have emerged, somehow reactive multipolarism rather than constitutive one, European Union (EU), G8, G20, Shangai Economic Cooperation; Russia, China, Iran, and South-East Asian Countries etc. The US' this leadership position is no doubt related to its dominance over the world energy sector and financial order to a certain extent. But, this paper is aiming at analyzing the role of "Extended Great Middle East Region" and its resources in the US' leadership efforts in the great power struggle. The analysis showed that contemporary geopolitical order conditions require that there should be more democratic strong state entities in this huge region which having new norms, regimes, rules and values. These new geopolitical 'soft' requirements may be achieved through democratization of Middle East and Central Asian societies. Thus, the role of US on one hand in these circumstances is to support democratization efforts in the region and on the other hand is to make this region a very close strategic partner for itself in the everlasting great power rivalry; so that It wish mainly to form or sustain its new or classical geopolitical order supremacy over the non-legitimated polities and to transform in the near future. All these systemic changes are very dramatic and turbulent and leads to the emergence of the reordering macro and micro movements because of both external and internal factors, too. At last, there is the governance of the new more interdependent order either unilateral or multilateral.

1. Introduction

After the end of Cold War and Post-September period, the political and the economic roles of US have dramatically changed. But, there is a debate going on as to the direction of this change.¹ Some scholars sees this change as the end of the history asserting that liberalism and capitalism have won the ever-lasting ideology struggle and thus there is no need for any ideology struggle anymore at least for Western World.² However, the conflicts emerged in the Balkans, Caucasus, Central Asia, and the Middle-East, need to be explained. In the study *The Clash of Civilizations*, conflicts have arisen because of the inherent difference in civilizations and also these conflicts occurred at the convergence of civilizations. There are some conflicts Bosnia-Herzegovina, Kosovo, Macedonia in the Balkans, Kashmir conflict in Pakistan-India, and the one in Chechnya and Karabag. Nonetheless, after 11 September attack, the Islam-phobia is a big problem in the Western polities. Whereas, the Afghan, Iraqi invasions and other direct and indirect interventions also feeds radicalism and the neocolonial anti-western perceptions in the eastern societies.

Those new political, ethnic and radicalism and religious section conflicts in Russia-Georgia, Iran, Iraq, Norway, Syria and other Arab Springs which direct the attentions in a constitutive democratic restructuring of the state and society and national cultural relations in regional and global politics. Though Iraq, Syria, Jordan and Pakistan are the artificial contours, politics is at the mercy of geography; the greater Indian Ocean region encompasses the entire arc of Islam, from the Sahara Desert to the Indonesian archipelago at which, today western reach of Somalia, Yemen, Malaysia, Bangladesh, Myanmar, China, Iran and Pakistan constitute a network of dynamic trade and terrorism and illegalities.³ However, these events showed that those conflicts require new explanations. However, we argue that unlike Fukuyama, Huntington, Afghanistan terror invasion theses, the main reason for emergence of these conflicts was the geopolitical struggles among the great powers.

*International Relations, Yalova University, Visiting Assist.Prof.Dr. International University of Sarajevo

**Adviser of the Assembly of Deputies of BSEC for TGNA.

Those theories covertly aimed to force the Western countries accept the premise of “the west and the rest logic” which necessitate the leadership role of the US that is why the US tries to maintain this hegemonic leadership in the second decade of Post-Cold War globalization process. In fact, the US has undoubtedly become the world’s biggest power since Second World War, but on the other hand, new powers to challenge the US have emerged, e.g. European Union (EU), China, Russian Federation, India, Iran⁴, and South-East Asian Countries etc.

In this paper, we will deal with the contemporary factors those having effects on the current US foreign policies. Specifically, the paper will argue that the importance and the place of US dollars in world trade (especially Bretton Wood Regime) has been changing. This has a very close relationship with the world trade because not only oil trade in the world has been realized using US \$ and this fact enables US to gain from dollar seigniorage and broadens the US’ trade scope.⁵ Moreover, this study assumes that US grand strategy, focusing on geo-strategic regions with the glasses of offensive realism with the hegemonic stability and balance of threat theory or chaos theory. The great powers are always seeking opportunities to attain more power as Susan Strange’ ‘structural power’ in order to feel more secure and also Jhon Mearshimer’s offensive realist quest maximum power to seek global hegemony. The success of US strategy political control over the lifeblood of modern economies, energy sources oil-gas; which composes the US war-time and peace-time strategies with the Eurasian regional powers Russia, India, China, EU and Iran.⁶ Recently, China, EU, and Russia have gained power by improving its own software design to compete and these countries have become counter forces against the US unilateral policies in the world affairs (Ukraine, Georgia, Kirghizistan, Iran, Libya, Syria).

The US cannot accept the dominance of these countries in the regions where oil and raw materials are extracted. Since these countries are now more powerful compared to the past, US cannot easily defeat the movements or tactics of these countries; which was accustomed to tackle the disputes during the Cold War era under the ideological disputes. In this new current situation, we assert that US will try to transform the countries in this region with the Great Middle-East project⁷ into the modern nation state format those states would be a geostrategic partners for achievement of the US’ interest and to minimize the dominance of the other power centers (EU, Russia and China).⁸ The paper in this context will examine the role of US is to restructure and transform the political and economic and social systems of the countries of the Great Middle East. The fact is that, the US rebuilt political and economic systems of the European countries and Japan against the SU after the post war process. All these policies would strengthen with Gramscian formulation of hegemony of the United States in the world. And also it could be justified the hegemonic stability theory of the Robert Gilpen.⁹ No needed omission, It is the US capability to affect the rentier economy’s budget balances with the political economy strategies which determines indirectly market prices of these raw materials.

It could be the foreign policy objectives of the US is to create the European type of modern nation states with the software of its own state system which would not create threats on the interests of the American political, economic, social and security targets. As Stalin comments to a Yugoslav leader, Milovan Djilas, in 1945: This war is not as in the past; whoever occupies a territory also imposes on it his own social systems. Everyone imposes his own systems as far as his army reach.¹⁰ In other words, a state uses its military forces to impose societies similar to its own in order to ensure its security. Whereas, the US not interested as the former SU wanted the tangible possessions, the territorial domination but Americans had intangibles or milieu goals. They were interested general context of the world politics, but there are some strategic sectors on which the US vulnerability is high that is why it uses the forces such as Granada, Panama, Dominic Republic, Afghanistan and Iraq. Moreover, there is sensitivity of the US which aims to change the software of the states by using its various nongovernmental actors.

Those are the National Endowment for Democracy (NED), National Democratic Institute for International Affairs (NDI), International Republican Institute (IRI), Freedom House headed by old CIA president James Woosley, International Center on Nonviolent Conflicts, NED and George founded Albert Einstein Institution and Soros’ Open Society Institute which is being used to transform the authoritarian regimes and instable countries. Towards the American hegemony this Freedom houses expressed that there 89 Freedom sponsored state, 30 state limited freedom and there are 49 state in which freedom suspended.¹¹ So the Georgian, Ukrainian and Kirghizia light political governmental transition can be better explained by the successful efforts of these NGO and Transnational actors or organizations and we may add Arab Springs there are also some counter interventions in all those countries, too.

So in this ebb and flow trends we can concentrate on the international migration routes and destinations¹² which also might be good places or lands for us where it may be mastering spaces¹³ or reordering the world's¹⁴ countries in this century, too.

2. The Effect of the End of the Cold War on the US Foreign Policy

What kind of changes made the ending of cold war period? The logic of cold war centered on two different opposing blocks. In this period, there were existed two ideologies, security and economic-based international relations were going on in an environment which was easy to understand and forecast. With the collapse of the former Soviet Union, new liberal reform-oriented trends realized in newly Commonwealth of Independent States and in East Europe ended the ideological conflicts and the thesis, named “the end of the history”, as stated above, in the article of Fukuyama described this fact. However, the ideological competition of the Cold War period, in fact, was a critical thing in the geopolitical competition among the great powers and it can also be said that this ideological competition had its roots from geopolitical gene differentiation.¹⁵ As formed in the security identity of the NATO and Warsaw Pact which determined their sphere of influence in the European continent and Third World proxy confrontations-instabilities, also showing their land or maritime power characters.

This was in fact related to state-centric realist theory in which the geography or the location, where the state was established, pressured to the state certain life styles and strategic movements. British classical geopolitics derived from the works of H. MacKinder, British geopolitical thinker, and Alfred Mahan, American General, explained the gene differentiation between the two blocks and at the same time it signified a relation system based on conflict and rivalry within the realm of the land powers and sea powers.¹⁶ The obvious proof of this was that a new politicians called Atlantic group, emerged in Russia after the collapse of the former Soviet Union, wanted to pursue close relationships with the US, but, their expectations did not realize. And US continued to determine its foreign policies as similar to those during the Cold War period without feeling the Cold War ideological constrains. For instance, US favors ‘ost-politik’ and EU inclusion that assured to protect the national unity of Poland(four times she lost independence) not to repeat another ‘Munich Syndrome’, that is why, the policy of enlargement of NATO can be better perceived in this framework by dividing these countries. In addition to that, creating pro-American regimes in the adjacent region of the South of Russian Federation and the aim of that was to prevent Russia from accessing to the coastal states and seaways.¹⁷

After the Post-Cold War period the US pursued same policy over the heartland regions mainly based upon the assumptions of the geopolitical scientist Nicolas Spykman’s Rim land theory¹⁸, upon that the Containment Theory of Georges Kennan, Domino Theory, National Security Council (NSC 68)” of Paul Ritches which substantiated on it. That is why the current US foreign policy is supporting pro-American regimes in the Rim land region, from the Central and Eastern Europe, Balkans, Turkey, Iraq, Libya, Tunisia, Egypt, Syria, Georgia, Kyrgyzstan, Ukraine, Azerbaijan, Armenia, Iran, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Taiwan, Korea, Japan etc. What was the main goal of the US’ policy? These strategies were applied after WW II to support the friendly governments against the Soviet Union. In the period of Cold War, the role of US was clear.¹⁹ There was an ideological struggle between two blocks and the US was leader of liberal countries, and its main function is to protect the liberal countries and liberal values on the coastal states against land power communist threat.

Having controlled the Heartland region plus rise of Soviet Union as a nuclear power and Communist China were a significant threat for the West and the US was only power to protect Western Maritimes Realm. The dominant position of the US seems not only from its success in economic and military development but also the demise of the economy of the European countries and Japan due to the destruction of WW II.²⁰ At 1970’s by the empowerment of Japan and the European Countries challenged the leading position of US in world economy.²¹

Especially the accumulation of US currency in the hands of Japans and Europeans was the source of the threat:competition; for instance the France benefited more by buying Gold from the Federal Reserve of the US. It was perceived that the circulating amount of dollars in world economy cannot be backed enough gold reserve by the Federal Reserve by which the Bretton Woods regime had been designed to regulate international trade, international finance, and national currencies which have been fixed on the US dollar vice versa to each other in 1944.²² In 1971, the President Nixon unilaterally declared the collapse of the Bretton Woods regime. It practically meant that the value of the dollar is being determined by the financial market according to the supply and demand functions as the real goods. At that times, the oil crises shocked the western economies but relatively it less influenced the US economy.

Because of the quadrupled oil price increase caused transferring accumulation of US currency from the hands of Japans and Europeans, which didn't have enough oil reserve to the oil producing countries, especially from Arabic countries. There was a factor that is the rise of the cost of oil which reduced the competitiveness of European and Japanese products in the world market due to their highly dependence on the Middle Eastern oils. Whereas the US dependent only 16 percent on this region, but the EC more than 60 percent and Japan more than 80 percent dependent on this region. That was one of the causes of the eurosclerosis of the European Integration.²³ In addition to, the Nixon doctrine which favored the US relations with the Shah of Iran that did not hesitate breaking the Oil embargo of OPEC, thereupon, the US imported its oil need from Venezuela and Indonesia. On the one hand, the majority of the oil industry under the control of the western countries such as seven sisters²⁴ as Mobil, Amaco, Enron etc.; because of the oil industry not only needs drilling but also it needed refinement, high technology, capital, marketing and transportation.²⁵

At the same time, rise of oil prices after oil crises became a fresh blood for the USSR economy. And then USSR became one of the leading oil producer and also start financing its import especially food by oil export. It is also the SU is a prominent actor in this "great oil-related game." That situation also favored the détente policy between the Eastern and the Western bloc. As result of this, USSR economy mainly depended on oil prices and other raw materials as natural gas. Americans started controlling USSR economy by oil prices. Americans used oil prices in order to accelerate the collapse of USSR during 1986-1987.²⁶ After the collapse of the USSR, Russian industry also collapsed and Russia became solely depended on oil prices. In this context, the financial crisis in 1998 must be investigated with the lowest level of oil prices at that time. Whereas, the IMF provided 140 billion \$ credit to the Russia. How can we explain this cooperation?. Off course, the further and another possible division of the Russian republics with the radical Chechen expansion in the Daghistan could threaten the Western geopolitical reordering in the Caucasus and Central Asia.

Thus, the control of the oil prices became a geo-economic instrument for the US against its potential geopolitical competitors. The geopolitical control of the oil-gas energy regions and its main transportations routes can influence the oil prices and the circulation of the US dollar in the world trade. That is why, the all geopolitical actors, they try to control and influence the countries of the oil regions and their large markets. For that reason, over the oil reserves regions from the Middle East to the Central Asia the hegemonic players aimed to establish their own hegemonic design by using hard and soft power tools and alternates.²⁷ Those hegemonic actors are America, EU, Russia, China, India, Turkey and Iran which attempts to control and determination the oil-gas pipelines in the Middle East, Caspian and Central Asia. In this context, the Iran's strong and willful-ambitious-desire for being and strong military and a nuclear power in the region perceived as a new geopolitical order player.²⁸

In this framework, despite the Post-Cold War period the Russia left the communist ideology and started to implement liberal political and economic policies, but now, which did not prevented it from to be perceived as a potential threat by the US due to its military strengths, nuclear capacities and geopolitical positions. Though Russia had been admitted into the "American international organizations" such as IMF, World Bank, OECD, G-8, G20 and NATO: observer and Peace for partnership. But Russia still is not a member of WTO. After the Cold

War, first decade, Russia heavily lost its former power, there was also the ideological barrier which prevented the political, economic and social strategic partnership between the SU and European Community; thus the absence of those barriers frightened the US foreign policy makers. In fact, the policy of the Russian Federation on the Central Asia and Caucasus can be analyzed in this perspective. In that situation, the main important point is not based on which side' policy triggered the other side reactions rather than the system of relations and interactions which is being shaped by the basis of rivalries of power politics of Geopolitical competitions.

Those institutions are very selective having new members and necessary for generating reasoned solutions to complex problems in the non-western regions so as to construct an effective and just world order that would empower of them.²⁹ This situation, again, in Russia brought back the traditional geopolitical reflections in the task. In a very short period, the classical text of the geopolitical science have been retranslated into new Russian political discourses. In addition, the current Russian authors and academicians printed books, journals, articles and opened institutions. Moreover, in Duma there is the Committee of Geopolitic-Eurasia Party-Alexander Dugin, advisor of the President V. Putin. At first, in the first period of the Post-Cold War process there were optimistic assumptions, now, it changed in the latter decade, which can be called as the geopolitical realism that emerged.

Dugin mainly argues that the Eurasian countries must develop their political, economic and social relations among themselves to create their own economic core or center against the Atlantic bloc which mainly established on the Anglo-American bloc aimed to disturb the relations between the coastal states of the Eurasia and the states of the Heartland region. Whereas during the 19th century and later the United Kingdom which divided those Eurasian powers and the Cold War era also maintained same situation with the help of communism, and now there is same threat those coastal states they are going to be periphery of the US. In this context, Putin expressed to form a common market as its own EU with CIS countries for presidential campaign in 2012 election.

Because of the strategic natural recourses such as oil, gas and their marketing in the world market Russia aims to establish its hegemonic power on the oils regions of CIS countries to favor its own geo-economic interest. In addition Russia bargains with these countries oil industries by using its own companies. Like US which provides security of Gulf Oil countries Russia also tries to support security of the Central Asian republics by using its own military capabilities, which opened the military bases in the these countries. Russia is very proactive in this sense and such as Custom Union and Emergency Intervention Security Forces like NATO formed by the Russian initiation with the major Central Asian Republics.

Upon that, generally, after 11 September attack, we may say Russian-US relations developed against Terrorism-radicalism and cooperation in Afghanistan operations but later Russia changed its position in re-building of new regime in the country against Taliban. Because of its violation of the strategic long term interest in the region. Thereupon, the US Senate also negotiated, after the Russia' direct challenges the western interest, that the Russia's anti-democratic policies both at the government-society relations and recentralization of Russian republics and also in "its backyard policies in the CIS republics".³⁰ Meanwhile, in the post-Cold War process, the US formed with Russia "Peace for Partnership" and it also developed other cooperative and bargaining initiatives with Russia to keep it within the Western system. The US wish it to be, at least, in the neutral positions, during the implementations of the specific policies in the various regional and continental areas, too.

In this perspective, the European Union has more advantage in geopolitical hegemonic competition in the world against the Clash of Civilization thesis which assumed the west is the one unique political unit with its peculiar civilization departs from the rest of the world, it emerges as a new geopolitical rival opposing to the US. But in this geopolitical competition the EU formulated new soft power instruments rather than hard power. In this context, the enlargement of the EU with the central and Eastern European countries based on the basis of the Copenhagen Criteria.

"Membership requires that the candidate country has achieved:

- 1. stability of institutions guaranteeing democracy, the rule of law, human rights and respect for and protection of minorities;**
- 2. the existence of a functioning market economy as well as the capacity to cope with competitive pressure and market forces within the Union;**
- 3. the ability to take on the obligations of membership including adherence to the aims of political, economic and monetary union."**³¹

The EU formed its own European political, economic and socio-cultural values systems.³² On 1 October 2005, it has started the accession agreement with Turkey as a full member of the EU within ten years, is a sign of the EU's geopolitical stance in the twenty first century within the multi polar system of world order. After the Cold War era, It tries to form the alternative European Internationalism by initiating the Barcelona process with its neighbors against the American unilateral Internationalism in the international state system.³³ but the EU perceived in the practices, has problems overcoming the rise of extreme nationalism, xenophobia and radicalism in Europe forming a normal functioning multicultural society as in the incidence of Norwegian massacres.

In this path, the emergence of the Euro as a rising competitor currency in the international market made the US specialists perceived as a serious threat. In 2000ies, Euro became a threat for US Dollar. In 1999, At first, the Euro had been introduced to the market as 1 euro makes 1.20\$ after a while it declined to one third its value but after the second Gulf war the Euro improved as 1 euro to around 1.30\$ which enhances the credibility of the euro as a transaction, cash and reserve money in the international market between the countries. Now, it fluctuates around 1.41\$ parities. That also Euro as a rising money would contribute in the European Political Unification which led to emergence of the European geopolitical identity.³⁴

In 2000, Saddam converted oil agreements in Euro. This was a serious strategic attack against American global economic interests. Different scholars told that this was the reason of the US attacked to Iraq in 2003. Economic power of the European Union and South Eastern Countries almost equal to US economy. The EU with its 459 million population has 10.5 trillion \$ GDP comparing the US with 292 million population 10.9 trillion \$ GDP; it is going to reaches the US capacity.³⁵ As a result of the end of the Cold War there are no longer ideological causes for maintaining Atlantic block. In addition to this there is no barrier for EU to establish its own geopolitical realms in the Eurasia by basing its own software values as an alternative to the US, that we mentioned above.

Last but not least, long cycle theory posits and international order provided by a world leader. George Modelski (1978) argues that the international system can be understood in terms of recurrent historical patterns, cycles or of world leadership. Each cycle of world leadership, lasting approximately 100 years, can be divided by four distinct phases-global war, world leadership, de-legitimation and de-concentration. The first process, a global war is a military conflict among the countries to determine the nature of the world order. Global war is a crude selection mechanism of the state that gets to decide the rules and norms of the new system. For example, World War II was a global war in that it provoked liberal, capitalist states against fascist, imperial dictatorships. Global wars are great ideological strife between block of states with different views as to how the world could be reordered. Moreover, world leadership, the winner of the global war consolidates its power and establishes its international organizations, norms, rules and laws. Through international organizations and law, the world leader's vision of world order is institutionalized and its dominant position legitimized. However, as the world leader's power capabilities decline, it enters the last stage, de-legitimation. During de-legitimation, rising challenges the world leader authority to lead. This great power competition erodes the foundation of world order the world leader has created. The fourth phase in the long cycle of world leadership is de-concentration. In this process, de-concentration, the world leader aims to dominate by force rather than domination by nonmilitary means. This further erodes the order and the power to maintain that order because such territoriality is a much more costly endeavor. The weakening of the world leader sets the stage for the next global conflict.³⁶

Like Modelski Ibn Khaldun too many countries ago, in his *Muqaddimah* made this kind of deterministic estimation about the life of the super power states for the birth of the state 40, for mature 40 and for death 40. There is also product cycle theory which after a while a new product line could be developed that is why the life of product can be furthered. There are new transnational actors who advocated their survival on the decline of the US. U.B. Laden says like the SU we forced it for a long ten year noneconomic military struggle in Afghanistan that caused its collapse; there is also the US in Iraq and Afghanistan could be forced to fight for military guerrilla struggle, at the end, it will go on bankruptcy.³⁷ We will also test the future whether it would influence the American economy negatively or not. And very soon the extended security charges and expenditures of the US overburden its financial crises. But there are also some measurements have been taken by the supreme geopolitical orders. The new Obama regime seems so 'smart' than the EU leading actors, in applying and maneuvering new strategies to overcome those difficulties and risks such as withdrawing the US soldiers both from Afghanistan and Iraq. Whereas, some regional powers in the region are in ambiguous positions in the completion of US mission in forming those countries' orders. The US policy is so flexible and adaptive not falling into 'the tragedy of the great powers' overstretching. It also supports the Arab Springs, favoring, forming and balancing the arguments of scientific realist, rationalist and constructive engagements in the regions. The EU leaders seemed, may be or not consciously, indecisive or averse to fix European sovereign debt crisis in Greece, Ireland, Spain, Portugal and Italy.³⁸ Thus, it will be easy to form the EU's fiscal sovereign unity both in maturing public perceptions and in furthering the political integration in the Europe.

3. The Challenges to Economic Leadership of the USA

Now, the leadership of the US became questionable not only economic but also their legitimacy problem on American social and cultural values. Inside US, the relations between Democrats and Republicans go to a polarization that cannot go back. American politics under the Bush government worsened the image of US as a symbol of liberalism, pluralism, freedom, tolerance and fragmentation. Imagining the US as a multicultural society may have some difficulties protecting its own internal peace. Under Clinton authority who pursued the liberal policies on abortion, homosexual marriages and the sexual abasement which made the Americans more conservative; plus September Eleven attack increased the American nationalism which negatively influenced not only political and the social attitudes against the foreigners in the realm of security.

In this context, Obama administration may be perceived as a restoration process in both political, social, economic and cultural pluralism areas. But it seems fragile in economy, finance, unemployment and security matters; that his successful policies could determine the stability and peace both at national and international level. It seems early to make a general conclusion. Because of multiple determinants could verify various opposing theses.

There are also the religious evangelical groups which aroused their influence on politics. Former president Bush was proud of his religious exhibitions not only in manners in politics but also his understandings the world politics which negatively influences that could provoke the other countries to pursue the nationalist conservative policies. For that reason, it could be threat to the legitimacy of US social and cultural values in the context of the geopolitical identity. Another indicates that the worsening image of the USA in the mind of the individuals that leads to the decrease in number of foreign researches that have a great share in technological and scientific improvement of the US. Beside this, foreign capital inflows, especially Arab petro-dollars, were offended by the pretext of terrorism. In this context, security problems made the investors anxious that is why they search for the other markets to invest. As a result of this fact American balance of payments got worsened. It is known that US represents national, western and global world order interests.³⁹ There seems some ambiguities in arranging and considering priorities' those interests. Because of the new so called security and political rational discourses may not meet the required interests of the various multinational corporations which seeks new spatial secure free lands.

Since 9-11, a small group of "neo-conservatives" in the Administration have effectively gutted--they would say reformed--traditional American foreign and security policy. Notable features of the Bush doctrine include the preemptive use of unilateral force, and the undermining of the United Nations and the principle instruments and institutions of international law.... all in the cause of fighting terrorism and promoting homeland security.⁴⁰ However, it would be so difficult to implement these measurement in this globalization process. Because, the USA maintains to be the geopolitical and geo-economic and geo-cultural center of the world in this interdependent world. For instance, in a year, therein 475 million people, 125 million vehicles and 21 million import shipments came into the country at 3700 terminals in 301 ports of entry. It takes five hours to inspect a fully loaded 40 foot shipping container, and more than 5 million enter each year. In addition 2.7 million undocumented immigrants have simply walked or ridden across Mexican and Canadian borders.⁴¹ But there are also negative effects for the US economy having foreign direct investments for instance a Dubai owned company had been excluded from the managements of a US marine privatization and also Turkish car company has been prevented from taxi bid and so on.

After the end of the Cold War the liberal capitalist political-economic model became victories in this process the other Eastern countries adopted western systems. Because of the globalization which created technological revolution in the information system. So in the mind of the game theory logic the other countries by benefiting the internet based information revolution they are learning very rapidly the rules of game both in economic and geopolitical sense in international system. One of the most important inventions of information age is the expansion of the internet computer technology which very easily transfers the knowledge from one place to the other part of the global world in production, marketing, design, advertisement, computer programs.

For that reason, there is no monopoly of the information and knowledge based power centers as in the past so it is shifting from the west to the east every changes. But the majority of the nonwestern states try to overcome their macro national, political and economic problems. Despite of they are negatively being affected those current financial, economic, political, social and cultural systems of the west. But, they are not in a position to create a legitimate alternative regional, international or global order like the US or the EU.

Somehow, they are being integrated into industrialization of the modernity and also by adopting some level of development and changes with their contributions, too.⁴² In the near future it is also expected that more than 50 % of world GDP will be produced in developing countries. Thus, there can be a mature economic conditions so as to democratize their political systems. For that reason, it may take some decades to establish functioning democratic infrastructures. Whereas, some geopolitical competitors they try to search for the alternatives possible orders.

There is also some great powers like China which seems so great latent power in reserving and flourishing rich power elements. The US constructive engagement policy may not be successful and it needs to counter balance the China's rise as regional and global hegemony.⁴³

4. The Policies of US against to the Challenges

The US strategy on this region, at first, can be summarized as to have military and security basis, to transport energy resources by proper pipelines routes through secure friendly states, to secure oil transporting sea ways and to support the regimes could establish strategic partnership with the US in the region. Oil pipelines first started Baku to Supsa line, then the real line Baku-Ceyhan in May 2005 has opened.⁴⁴ And then Baku-Tiflis and Ceyhan pipeline have been pumping oil since May 2006. There are also various alternatives trade routes: high ways, railroads(Kars-Tiflis), oil and gas pipeline projects have been under construction to diversify and balance the great powers in the region, such as Nabucco project. US want to build regimes friendly to the EU and the West and also to balance the rival geopolitical power concentrations which challenge the interests of the free markets forces.

That is why, in the security context, the attacks on ‘World Trade Center’ convinced the American public opinion to support the US conservative politicians in implementing “the Great Middle Eastern Project”. The US forces the rogue states, totalitarian, authoritarian and undemocratic regimes to obey the basic rules and norms of the international regimes by changing and transforming their own software structure into modern democratic form. In this sense, we may say that the Obama administration maintain Bush policies, too; but somehow, his methodological differences perceived by the help of public diplomacy, multilateralism and international organizations, as mild than Bush so as to transform and further interest of the US’ universal Global Order.

But, in the long run, in order to realize that goal, it will support regional countries to make them ‘able to live on themselves. The cost of controlling the region by the US is rising. And also control of another power is a worse alternative. Today, Mackinder theory of heartland as if an old theory, which claims only territorial control of heartland. But the heartland region rich natural resources especially oil/natural gas. This factor makes central Heartland in oil related Great Game. According to MacKINDER heartland is very good location for global hegemony, sea powers has no capability control this landlocked area. That’s why the US has minimal possibilities to control the region, though the US has air power supremacy its sufficient to establish stable geopolitical control over the region. Hazar Oil reserves are the second largest reserve after Middle East. In the short run, if the US doesn’t enter in this region in the long run there is no worry for China and other geopolitical actors to enter in this region. That case being called as “the second game” or we call new great game.⁴⁵

All these systemic changes how does it influence the US policies? On the one hand, the end of cold war abolished one of the enemy blocs; on the other hand it created the basis for the emergence of the potential new rivalry blocs. There is no doubt that the most important one among these blocs is the European Union emerged an independent economic unit and it tries to constitute the other aspects of the being a super state step by step.⁴⁶ The other bloc is the Russian centered bloc. In the former SU geography, the Russian Federation formed a new integration movement as the Common Independent States (CIS) among those newly Independent countries. Thereafter, Russian Federation, against the US’ one unipolar world system, it declared to form an alliance with India and China and it established Shanghai Cooperation Organization among those countries. The other power center is the China has a continuously growing dynamic economic structure since President Deng Xiaping after death of Mao he replaced him. From 1978 till 2000’ies annual economic growth 7-8 percent.⁴⁷

The divide of the West itself in two, by the time, the EU as an economic integration project; has the EU been designed a new political structure against the US? The demise of the Soviet military threat made the EU more relax within its own region. In the Post-Cold War process, the divided Germany unified and by the way divided Western Europe started to unify with its old central and eastern European countries.⁴⁸ And now the EU having new members from 12 to 27 with 500 million populations, became that speed up the progression of the EU into more strict unity between the widening versus deepening dichotomy.

Though, the some EU members vetoed its constitution, but later they revised it as a Lisbon agreement(2007) and accepted the new EU Treaty and 2020 strategy to be an information based economy, to overcome structural problems of the EU in various sectors and political-social problems-aging society.

5. The Emergence of the EU Challenge against the US?

At that point, NATO as an institution of the Anglo-American geopolitical construct that lost its enemy so it is an organization, now, this lost its mission. After the Soviet era, it is assumed that the “Red Threat” replaced by the “Green Threat” but this argument has not been shared much by the International Society.

May be, if the thesis of Clash of Civilizations had been justified, the West would be continued its unity under the leadership of the US. But only, new emerging geopolitical conjuncture is the European centered on which created France and German axis which is willing to dare to challenge against the US on the basis of politics, economy and culture.⁴⁹ Conjectural changes in France and German politics, there is formed “Alliances of Civilizations” thesis with Turkey and Spain. Though, this EU power matured its economic capability on the supranational level, but its power on military and security dimension stayed on the intergovernmental rather than supranational level.

There are attempts to form a supranational structure on the defense and security policy such as European Army. By the Lisbon agreement there are also many improvements in deepening EU integration, no reference for federalism and Constitution, but they formed EU foreign and security high representative and appoint of head of European Council for 2.5 year. Meanwhile, there are revisions in voting and representations in Commission and Council of ministers, too.⁵⁰ In fact, we should admit that it is not so easy to form one unique foreign policy in the process of the restructuring authority and territoriality in the EU-27 like a nation state.⁵¹ By the time we have seen some success of the peace-building forces of the EU in Bosnia, independent Kosovo, Macedonia, Croatia and that just replaced the NATO therein. The closes EU axis powers disapproved openly the US policies in the last Iraqi military operations. Though some members of the EU joined into Iraqi operations with America one by one they made up their policies and left the US therein by denouncing their wrong actions. Anymore, Immanuel Wallerstein he also stresses that now the US and European alliances can be ‘so called alliances’. The differences between them emerges in their positions and approaches towards the tackling the disputes varies on Iran, Iraq, Northern Korea, Kyoto Protocol, international criminal courts, weapon embargo on China, satellites Galileo or GPS, usages of modified seeds, Airbus or Boeing and lastly the rise of the Euro.⁵² moreover, the EU wish to introduce itself as the humanitarian development, economic, political and legal power for global leadership rather than a hard power.⁵³

In addition, we must underline that the EU is a global and also unique welfare social model among various polities in the turbulent globalization process. That influences and compete with the US and Chinese model, too.⁵⁴ But there are also some indirect influence in the politics of major members of the EU by the US especially in German and French politics. Furthermore, we may add the case of the president of IMF would be candidate for France’ future president.⁵⁵ Anyway, those states foreign policies now seems very close with the US policies on the NATO expansion, Iran and Arab Springs, too. Nonetheless, those leaders seems having some difficulties with their conservative infrastructure in furthering and directing the EU vision in solving the current economic crisis. We assert the argument that current economic and financial crises creates a political reasoning to form a fiscal union after the Euro in the EU integration. Because of the economic and financial crises in the US and with its military engagement in the global order brings high risk for the EU economy and Euro. Thus we optimistically support the current financial crises in the EU is conjectural but the poor members of the EU have also some structural economic, social and political problems. Thus, here, we can be very hesitant or reductionist in reading the fall of the west(The Great Crash, 2008)⁵⁶ or the US or the EU because there is no any alternative political, economic and social order of liberal democracy, regime, norms and values to replace the current international system.⁵⁷

But we can’t say easily that they will overcome this crises by more productions but there seems some more radical re-regulations and reforms in the capitalist state models.⁵⁸ There seems optimistically some a normal capitalist business cycle’ up and downs.

6. The US’ Possible Alternative Policies to Overcome the Paradox

In the short run, it is possible though there is no military challenge to the US but there could emerge a serious economic challenge against it. The authors such as Paul Kennedy analyzed that, in the long run, the rise and fall of the great powers trends by stating that this economic challenge also would affect the military strength of great powers which in the long run can’t maintain its that status.

Today, one of the reasons of the US being an economic power of the world dependent on mainly usages of the dollars as the transactions and reserve currency in the globe between the countries. This position of the dollar directly related to the international trade like the oil market of the world is being charged in this currency. The rise of the global consumption and production(stretching, speed up, thickening, deepening) in the world market also it increases the oil trade that is why the US unilaterally increases the emission of the dollar in the market.

That is so the US could meet and finance its rising trade deficit indirectly increasing the emission of the dollar. The Euro as the European currency unit started to replace the dollar trade in the world market that challenges very seriously the throne of the US dollars. Moreover, this power gives a strategic tool for the US so as to affect their economy proper with its own geopolitical agendas and foreign policies priorities and strategies.

Those so called competitors EU, Russia, China, Japan, India and Iran and Turkey also which their economy highly dependent on the energy industry. Here, Russia must protect its economy from the vicious circle of the rentier entrapment of the natural resources and undemocratic political so called restorations which doesn't comply with the free market regimes, norms and rules. Otherwise, it is delegitimize its own polity and authority in both at home and regions. Russia, China and Iran without transforming their political, economic and social system with the liberal democratic pluralist standards, it seems for them difficult to integrate with the postmodern international system. Though China is being second largest exporting country in the global system, it may not overcome polity, political, social, economic, legal, nationalities, human and minority rights, urbanization, labor rights and environmental problems, and sustaining current internal system.

Turkey is being within the NATO, Western geopolitical identity and wish joining into EU league could more integrate with the Central Asia and Middle East.⁵⁹ Moreover, it is successful in bilateral, regional and global relations with the states, institutions and NGOs. In addition, she is good at harmonizing Western secular mundane rationality and its eastern moral spiritual human development with the multivariable and multi-dimensional gathering and creating in its own visionary multi-original vectored integrations. Turkey's full transformations will and adopting EU's 35 chapter norms till 2014 also changed its structural capabilities in agreed with the US a 'model for partnership'. It also seemed somehow 'wishfully' a geopolitical partner in the region. Off course for a regional and global power, there is need more material and humanitarian developments, efforts and contributions, too. Turkey's democratic opening initiatives(Kurdish) seems managing over, would create a more just, equal, democratic stable well governed polity⁶⁰ which could exceed an strategic barrier to be a regional and global power. We must express that the problem is not only multidimensional and but also encompasses intra-interregional reordering, and it can be solve in the mid-long run.

There must be zero tolerance for the illegal use of terrorist activities so that protection of human rights, freedom, cultural and sub-national identities, multiculturalism, democratic peace and stability of the region. But there are probable changes in polities, regime, norm, law and rule in the Middle Eastern countries(Iraq, Syria and Iran) could shift the actors future expectations and so who cares current common rationalities of the various formulations of the solutions. Generally saying in the regions: Central-South America, Eastern Europe, Balkans, Africa, Middle East, Caucasus, Central Asia(Türkistan), Far east and South Asia those states Russia, China and Iran also acted in many geopolitical confrontations as the side of the conflicts within and between the contending parties. For instance Russia's position behind the counter-revolution in the Arab Springs.⁶¹ In the context of the Green threat(Islamophobia, War against Terror), this had been thought to protect the solidarity of the Western bloc, which has been transformed quickly into the expansion of the anti-American felt and mood in the world. It leded the rise of the xenophobia, nationalism, radicalism and intolerance which threatens the freedom, pluralism and democracy in the Europe and US.

Now, the US changed its policy with Obama, on diplomacy, multilateralism, cooperation and favoring of International Organizations. But, the one radical 'Christian' in Norway showed the danger and level of the threat xenophobia and Islamophobia so the EU and US has some structural problems and paranoia overcoming this paradox.

The basis of the conflict as Paul Kennedy asserted that like the US encounter with that problems whether the great powers could make an arrangement or optimization policies between the current existent resources and the excess enlargement or not in the context of imperial overstretch.⁶² Former government seems to relief itself from this kind of generous promises. The Bush policies of the US seemed as the nationalist and isolationist before the September eleven attack. But there is the question or dilemma how this power vacuum gap can be filled? Whether the EU could replace this power vacuum? It is up to the political and military capability if they might constitute. In the long run, the US military and economic power would be weakened but as a rivalry between the great regional powers lest they could enter in this region, from the Morocco to the Indonesia and to the Central Asia the US would look for the partnership with those countries by shaping its alternative strategic arrangements of this small powers would become compatibles its software's with the US.

But, there are current economic crises and Iraqi-Afghan invasions like Cuba-Vietnam there are some difficulties in the US and some EU members. There is no need for us to make any overestimation. Against to attributed unipolarity of US empire: because of easy victory in Bosnia-Kosovo-Iraq-afghan; So called the multipolarity of the rest: Both superpower candidates Russia and China with reference their GDP and per capita by comparing US they are weak and economically trying to integrate into capitalist free market order, then having mature social and economic middle class they may join into the liberal democratic leagues.⁶³ Meanwhile, there is doubt in that how they will constitute a real effective stable democratic polity from an electoral, hybrid or authoritarian democracies in Russia, China⁶⁴ and Iran compatible with their property, social, economic, political cultural systems.⁶⁵

Tough economic crises, in fact the EU relatives 2010 GDP values(14.86 trillion \$) past the US (14.66trillion\$) performance proper its 2001 Lisbon strategies.⁶⁶ But if the EU could overcome its enlargement, deepening, political integration and manageability of economic performances and information economy problems, there is no doubt to lead the global leadership role apart or with the US. Last but not least optimistically, the EU's success is up to its capacity forming a plural multicultural or post-national society⁶⁷ better than the US pluralist society system. And its successful enlargement policies' sustainability is also very important like having Croatia in 2013 or Turkey in 2015.

Because of the globalization deepens the interdependency between the countries. Optimistically, we hope that new organizational structure of the productions which also peacefully shapes the new forms of society, state and order. So there needs no new hegemonic struggles for the new order in the usage of Gilpin' war and change. Globalization much contributes in both Americanization and capitalization of the World.

7. Conclusion

As a result, the main factor determining US role in the new period is the geopolitical great power rivalry. In this rivalry, the relative declining of the US power and the nonexistence of a real external threat(like communism-somewhat religious radicalism) uniting the Western Block is challenging the US. Even if the US continues overcoming risk of globalizations in trade, finance and monetary systems⁶⁸ energy resources trades-dollar economic instruments⁶⁹, it used in Cold War period, the facts that global geopolitical conditions changed and the US itself is not sole independent geo-economic power so the US unilateral policy initiatives do not create a new stable and viable order.

However, the US is not willing to let the events to be totally uncontrolled. We argue that, US will continue to use classical geopolitical instruments and at the same time it will try to prevent the rivals from having dominance in alternate solutions in strategic states. In order to realize this, the US will no doubt strengthen the countries to which it can construct close and rational relationships and it will also strive to make these countries very close to strategic alliances for the sake of liberal democratic norms.

In this context, the policies of the US in Central Asia and Middle East should not be understood as a new imperialism tools. At first, in the short run, though America and regional states would be significant winner from these policies, these countries are also getting substantial benefits in the long run. We assert that these policies have some strong and long term roots. If US don't implement these policies, major rivals such as EU, Russia⁷⁰,

Iran and China will increase their dominance in the region. The likely result of this situation is that the geopolitical dominance of US and EU will relatively lessen. There are global and regional hegemonic International Organizations could be reformed and also include more countries to form and create more democratic, stable regional and also a fair international system from a normative perspectives.

There is a direct correlation between the oil-gas sectors and national security of the rentier states. That is why the great powers accept small and weak countries having the economic powers(natural resources) in which they are dependent on the hegemonic powers which assure the national security for the weak powers. In this framework, therein the periphery rim-land territories neoliberal and globalizing capitalist order⁷¹ would be constructed within the realist understandings by the post-territorial warfare methodologies. Thus the number of liberal democratic states may increase as the fourth waves of S.Huntingtons.⁷² But building a new state regime-society relations is a very difficult task in the new polity. These democratization movements all affects the authoritarian polities in the whole regions either small-big or weak-poor states. As a result the role of NGOs and international and regional organizations also get more important in both domestic and transnational lands, in the 21.st century, too.⁷³

To sum up there is a strict competition-contention, conflict, confusion and cooperation between the geopolitical actors(US, EU, Russia, China, India, Turkey, Iran)⁷⁴ as foreign policy alternatives which may vary also temporary-permanent-general-specific-tactical-strategic situations and choices. In which the geopolitical powers do not hesitates in assassinations despite of violating sovereignties of the countries . One fallacy, for instance so as to protect their national, western and global interest they wish to direct any state' foreign policy, is Turkey abandoning the West?⁷⁵ In a nutshell, the geopolitical actors though they are trying to reduce nuclear arms, but the five veto big power states those economic crises they are first among the countries which share their budget for armaments. In 2010, 1.3% increase in military expenditure more than former year, the world military expenditure 1, 63 trillion\$(US:42.8, China:7.3, Eng:3.7, France:3.6, Russia:3.6, japan:3.4, Italy:2.3, India:2.5, Germany:2.8, Saudi:2.8, others:25).⁷⁶

At last, Joseph Stiglitz, since three years the US and EU are not able to overcome the current economic crises that is structural problem rather than conjectural. Because of measurements are not being implemented quickly and the US and EU' economic growth is low that can't decrease the unemployment. The developing countries managing their economic growth with their internal demands and dynamics. He says that I am pessimistic about world economy because of quest for common solutions declined. On the contrary, this current financial crisis is the regular crisis of the capitalism in the context of the business cycle.⁷⁷

Turkey also doing well and growing but there is risk of high current account deficit during the world economic crises which means a structural problem.⁷⁸ That is why, Turkey, after fixing general and structural macroeconomic policy, now it seriously and optimistically has concentrated on microeconomics and specifics sectors one by one to decrease the current account and trade balance deficits. Turkey also tries to support the democratic transition periods of the Arab Springs by referring its social, economic and political model proper with the secular, liberal, democratic and national model. But she looks also for different geopolitical gap opportunities to deepen its pivot positions in both humanitarian concerns, North-South dichotomy, sea/oceans/maritime or land/continental air power centers, coastal and inner heartland interests. Somehow it focus in regionalist-zonalist interest but also exhibits pluralist geopolitical quests. As Murat M. Hakkı underlines that whether Turkey should be soft or hard power, he wishes soft preferences idealistically but there are realities of any orders base its foot securing power through tacit or explicit hegemonic consent. Its ratio is up to the actor' smartness in favoring and balancing freedom, legitimacy and interest of the states in the order.

One scholar stress that in any conditions either soft or hard liberal interventionist approaches which is able to change non-western authoritarian or totalitarian polities. However, they are in a position either accept or reject both would lose and lose. Because they have problems in forming their own plural society in national, regional and global level; then having managing all this, they may challenge neo-liberal the cosmopolitan model of democracy in the globalization process via creating new ones.⁷⁹ Some scholars express who could say no the unilateralism of US and no longer Asia's model; its supremacy does not come from its soft powers, because of certain geopolitical good fortune, abundance of resources, immigrant energy, a generous flow of capital and technology from Europe, two wide oceans kept away conflicts of the world away from the US shores.⁸⁰ So the failure in the economy may corrupt the society's cohesion, values, norms and regimes, too.

Notes

¹ Terry Boswell and Albert Bergesen, *America's Changing Role in the World System*, New York: Praeger, 1987. R. E. McCoy, "America's Role in the Great Game and What We need to Know Today", November 11, 2001, ExNews.

² Francis Fukuyama, "The End of History?", *The National Interest*, Summer 1989 <http://www.wku.edu/~sullib/history.htm>

³ Robert D. Kaplan, "Center Stage for the Twenty-first Century: Power Plays in the Indian Ocean", *Foreign Affairs*, March/April 2009, pp.16-32.

⁴ <http://www.globalpost.com/dispatch/worldview/100110/nuclear-cascade?page=full>(30 May 2010).

⁵ Joshua Goldstein, "Money and Bussiness" in *International Relations*, Fourth Edition, New York: Longman, 2001, p. 395-404.

⁶ Emre İseri, *The US Grand strategy and the Eurasian heartland in the 21st century:with special reference to the main Caspian oil export pipeline BTC*, Unpublished PhD Thesis, March 2008.

⁷ Atilla Sandıklı and Kenan Dağcı, *Büyük Orta Doğu Projesi:Yeni Oluşumlar ve Değişen Dengeler*, Tasam Yayınları, Nisan 2006, 97-104, 117-148.

- ⁸ Yılmaz Tezkan-M. Murat Tasar, *Dünya Bugüne Jeopolitik*, Ülke Kitapları, Kasım 2002.
- ⁹ Robert Gilpin, *Understanding Global Economy*, Princeton University, 2001
- ¹⁰ Milan Djilas, *Conversation with Stalin*, Trans. Michael B. Petrovich (San Diego:Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1962), p. 114 Cited in Joseph S. Nye, *Understanding International Politics*, Fourth Edition, Longman Classics, 2003, p.115
- ¹¹ İbrahim Karagül, “Amerika’nın Hegemonyasına Doğru”, *Yeni Şafak* (Newspaper), 5 Nisan 2005.
- ¹² Thomas Faist, *Uluslararası Göç ve Ulusaşırı Toplumsal Alanlar*, Bağlam, Çev. A.Z.Gündoğan-C.Nacar, 2000-2003.
- ¹³ Jhon Agnew and Stuart Corbridge, *Mastering Space: Hegemony, territory and International Political Economy*, Routledge, 1995.
- ¹⁴ George J. Demko and William B. Wood, *Reordering the World: Geopolitical Perspectives on the Twenty-First Century*, Westview Press, 1999.
- ¹⁵ Александр Дугин. Основы геополитики, Артогея, Москва, 1997, стр. 46.
- ¹⁶ Gearoid O Tuathail and Simon Dalby, *Rethinking Geopolitics*, Edited, London and New York: Routledge, 1998
- ¹⁷ Aleksandr Dugin, *Rus Jeopolitiği: Avrasyacı Yaklaşım*, Kure Yayınları, Çev. Vugar İmanov, Temmuz 2003.
- ¹⁸ The Rimland Theory says that the main power center not located on the heartland region but it centered on the Rimland region which confines the Heartland Region on the coastal states, which prevents from the access of the Heartland States into the open seas. They were not able to constitute core trade structures.
- ¹⁹ The elements of the modern geopolitics can be counted, territorial power-territorial enemy, Maps-geopolitical man, domestic-international, East-West, Hardware ascendant: GPR, states-leaders within the realm of the ideological geopolitics.
- ²⁰ Kathleen E. Braden and Fred M. Shelly, *Engaging Geopolitics*, Prentice Hall, 2000, p.10-35.
- ²¹ İmmanuel Wallerstein, *Jeopolitik ve Jeokültür*, İz Yayıncılık, İstanbul- 1998 (1. baskı 1993)
- ²² Theodore H. Cohn, *Global Political Economy: Theory and Practice*, 2.edition, 2003, Pp.25-56
- ²³ Brenth F. Nelson and Alexander C-G. Stubb, *Readings on the Theory and Practice of European Integration*, Second Edition, Macmillian Press, 1998, p.335-345.
- ²⁴ Anthony Sampson, *Günümüzde Petrol Oyunu*, Çev. Aziz Üstel, Altın Kitaplar Yayınevi, Mart 1976, pp.189-209.
- ²⁵ One of the causes of Japan attack on Pearl Harbor was the US economic embargo it was the oil embargo aimed to force Japan to withdraw from China.
- ²⁶ David S. Painter and Thomas S. Blanton, “The End of the Cold War”
<http://chnm.gmu.edu/roy/post45/POS25.pdf#search=‘After%20the%20end%20of%20cold%20war%20%20US%20role’/> 5th April 2005
- ²⁷ Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci says that the powers of the hegemony not only based on the military hard powers but its soft powers (opinions, ideas, organizations, culture etc.) which strengths and maintains the powers of the hegemony.
- ²⁸ Kenan Dağcı and Atilla Sandıklı, *Satranç Tahtasında İran Nükleer Program*, Tasam Yayınları, Ocak 2007, pp.7-360.
- ²⁹ Anne Marie Slaughter, *A New World Order*, Princeton, New Jersey, 2005, pp.200-260.
- ³⁰ İlyas Kamalov, *Putin Dönemi Rus Dış Politikası: Moskova’nın Rövanşı*, Yediğün Yayınevi, Ocak 2008, pp.33-34.
- ³¹ <http://europa.eu.int/comm/enlargement/intro/criteria.htm> (May 2005).
- ³² Baska Buystrica, International Conference, *Models of European and World Integration*, September 12-14, 2001.
- ³³ Baska Buystrica International Conference, *World, Europe And National State*, 2004.
- ³⁴ Stephan George and Ian Bache, *Politics In the European Union*, Oxford University Press, 2001.
- ³⁵ OECD figures in 2004, Eurostat
- ³⁶ Kelly-Kate S. Pease, *International Organizations*, Prentice Hall, 2003, p. 48.
- ³⁷ Quoted by Hurriyet.com.tr from El-Cezire TV (3 November 2004).
- ³⁸ [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/European_sovereign_debt_crisis\(20.10.2011\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/European_sovereign_debt_crisis(20.10.2011))
- ³⁹ Richard Little and Michael Smith, *Perspectives on World Politics*, Routledge, 3.ed., 2006.
- ⁴⁰ Stephen Green, ‘Neo-Cons, Israel and the Bush Administration’,
[http://www.itszone.co.uk/zone0/viewtopic.php?t=13601\(13-04-2005\)](http://www.itszone.co.uk/zone0/viewtopic.php?t=13601(13-04-2005))
- ⁴¹ Joseph S. Nye, *Understanding International Politics*, Fourth Edition, Longman Classics, 2003, p.219
- ⁴² Bknz. Atilla Sandıklı and İlhan Güllü, *Geleceğin Süper Gücü Çin: Uzakdoğudaki Entegrasyonlar ve Şangay İşbirliği Örgütü*, Tasam Yayınları, Ekim 2005.
- ⁴³ Jhon J. Mearshimer, *The Tragedy of the Great Power Politics*, University of Chicago, New York, 200, ss.401.402
- ⁴⁴ Мурат Бакыр, кандидатская диссертация «Объективные условия разработки проекта нефтепровода Баку-Джейхан и История Переговорного процесса по его реализации» Москва, Институт востоковедения, РАН, 2003.
- ⁴⁵ Seyfettin Erol, *Küresel Güç Mücadelesinde Avrasya’nın Değişen Jeopolitiği: Yeni Büyük Oyun, Barış/Platin Yayınları*, Ocak 2009, pp7-193.
- ⁴⁶ Dominic McGoldrick, *International Relations Law of the European Union*, London, 1997.
- ⁴⁷ Willian A. Joseph, Mark Kesselman, Joel Krieger, *Introduction to Third World Politics*, Second Edition, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 2000, p. 38-50.
- ⁴⁸ Baska Buystrica, *Geopolitical Importance of Central Europe and Its Prospects*, International Conference, 2002.

- ⁴⁹ On the contrary to the American clash of civilization thesis, it could be good example that Europe don't intend to struggle with the other civilizations German Chancellor Gerhard Shroder appreciated the works of scientist from Goethe University Prof. Dr. Fuat Sezgin who work on the compliance the eastern and the western civilization who wrote a 5 cit. chronological index book which writes the 800 inventions of the Muslim scientist since 9th century to 16th century, it is now the exhibition in the museum in Frankfurt. "Dogudan Yukselen Isigi Batiya Tanitan Adam", *Radikal* (Newspaper), <http://www.radikal.com.tr/haber.php?haberno=147789> (27/03/2005)
- ⁵⁰ İrfan Kaya Ülger, *Avrupa Birliği Rehberi*, Umuttepe Yayınevi, Mart 2008, pp.89-91.
- ⁵¹ Christopher K. Ansel and Giuseppe di Palma, *Restructuring Territoriality: Europe and the United States Compared*, Cambridge, 2004, pp.3-18.
- ⁵² Immanuel Wallerstein, "Avrupa ve ABD Sozde Muttefikler", *Zaman* (Newspaper), [http://www.zaman.com.tr/?bl=yorumlar&trh=20050411&hn=161008\(13-04-2005\)](http://www.zaman.com.tr/?bl=yorumlar&trh=20050411&hn=161008(13-04-2005)). He also implies in his article in 'Neither fear nor Despise' he suggest that the US should go on achieving its objectives by using the various advantages within the realm of realism. He is also proud of Tony Karon who quoted him 'Bush administration neither fear nor despise the developing sectors of the international society but they increasingly discarded them.
- ⁵³ Charlotte Bretherton and Jhon Vogler, *the European Union as a Global Actor*, Routledge, 2006, pp.62-215.
- ⁵⁴ Anthony Giddens, Patrick Diamond and R.Liddle, *Global Europe Social Europe*, Polity Press, 2006, pp.1-296.
- ⁵⁵ "The Downfall of DSK" *The Economist*, 21-27 May 2011, pp.27-36
- ⁵⁶ Roger C. Altman, "The Great Crash, 2008: A Geopolitical Setback for the West", *Foreign Affairs*, January/February 2009, pp.2-14.
- ⁵⁷ Daniel Deudney and G.Jhon Ikenberry, "The Myth of the Autocratic Revival: Why Liberal Democracy will Prevail", *Foreign Affairs*, January/February 2009, pp.77-93.
- ⁵⁸ Bob Jessop, *Devlet Teorisi: Kapitalist Devleti Yerine Oturtmak*, Çev.A.Özcan, Epos Yayınları, Mayıs 2008, pp.410-452.
- ⁵⁹ Bülent Aras, *The New Geopolitics of Eurasia and Turkey's Position*, Frank Cass, London, 2002.
- ⁶⁰ Fuat Keyman, "The CHP and the Democratic Opening: Reactions to AK Party's Electoral Hegemony", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.12, No.2, 2010, pp. 91-123.
- ⁶¹ Pavel K. Baev, "The Russia's Counter Revolution Stance Toward the Arab Spring", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.13. No.3, 2011, pp.11-19.
- ⁶² Paul Kenndy, *Büyük Güçlerin Yükselişi ve Çöküşü*, İş Bankası Yayınları.
- ⁶³ Stephen G. Brooks and William C. Wohlforth, "Reshaping the World Order: How Washington Should Reform International Institutions", *Foreign Affairs*, March/April 2009, pp.49-63.
- ⁶⁴ Hasan Bilgin, *Stratejik Açıdan Çin*, Uşak Yayınları, Şubat 2010.
- ⁶⁵ Ronald Inglehart and Christian Welzel, "How Development Leads to Democracy: What We Know About Democracy", *Foreign Affairs*, March/April 2009, pp.33-48
- ⁶⁶ <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/ee.html>
<https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/us.html>
- ⁶⁷ Will Kymlicka, *Çok Kültürlü Yurttaşlık: Azınlık Haklarının Liberal Teorisi*, Ayrıntı, 1995-1998. Bknz. Burak Erdener, *Avrupa Kimliği: Pan-Milliyetçilikten Post-Milliyetçiliğe*, Ümit, Ocak 2005.
- ⁶⁸ Asaf Savaş Akad, *The Political Economy of Globalisation: The New Identity of State in the 21'th Century*, Ankara, 1999, pp.1-27-40, 99-103.
- ⁶⁹ Gungor Uras who is a Turkish Journalist says after the Iraq occupation the average oil price expected as 35\$ a barrel of crude oil but it is 45\$ average so the Oil companies of the West as Exxon Mobil' profits 25 billion\$, Shell' profits 18\$ billion and BP's profits 16\$ billion which burdens the oil importing countries. "Amerikanci Petrolculer Para Kesiyor", *Milliyet* (Newspaper), <http://www.milliyet.com.tr/2005/04/11/yazar/uras.html> 11-04/2004.
- ⁷⁰ Robert O. Freedman, "Putin Döneminde Rusya'nın Ortadoğu Politikası", pp.61-85. in Bülent Aras, *Irak Savaşı Sonrası Ortadoğu*, Tasam Yayınları, 2004.
- ⁷¹ Walter C. Opello and Stephen J.Rosov, *The Nation State and Global Order: A Historical Introduction to Contemporary Politics*, Lynne Rienner, 2004, pp.245-264.
- ⁷² Samuel P. Huntington, *Üçüncü Dalga: Geç 20. Yüzyılda Demokratikleşme*, Kilit Yayınları, Çev.E.Özbudun, 2010.
- ⁷³ Semra C. Mazlum and Erhan Doğan, *Sivil Toplum ve Dış Politika: Yeni Sorunlar, Yeni Aktörler*, Bağlam Yayınları, Kasım 2006.
- ⁷⁴ İbrahim Okçuoğlu, *Emperyalist Küreselleşme ve Jeopolitika*, Ceylan Y. Şubat 2009, Pp.175-230
- ⁷⁵ Kılıç Buğra Kanat, "Ak Party's Foreign policy: Is Turkey Turning Away from the West", *Insight Turkey*, Vol.12. No.1 2010, p.205.
- ⁷⁶ SIPRI, Stockholm Peace Enstitutes, 2010 Armament Reports, *Zaman* Newspaper, 12 September 2011, p.9.
- ⁷⁷ Vikram Mukhija, *Introduction to Politics*, Pearson, 2010, ss.297-298.
- ⁷⁸ Abraaj Capital, *Zaman* Newspaper, İstanbul, 17 September 2011, p.14.
- ⁷⁹ Tim Dune, "Liberalism", in Jhon Baylis, Steve Smith, Patricia Owens, *The Globalization of World Politics*, Oxford, 2008, ss.107-121.
- ⁸⁰ Nathan Gardels, *The Changing Global Order*, Blackwell, 1997, ss.74-79,85.